

1. p. 12 Add the following sentence at the end: While the overall effect is expected to be small, significant differences may occur in some years.

2. p. 10 Add the following phrase to the first sentence in Alternative 2: ", although of a magnitude typically less than that which occurred historically."

Insert the following sentence as a new next to last sentence in paragraph on Alternative 2: Such reduced flows will likely reduce the survival of young chinook salmon and striped bass travelling down the river. (I couldn't find any other place where it seemed logical to respond to Bruce's comment. I do not see it as being applicable to diversion effects.)

3. p. 12 I struggled to add the overall perspective Bruce is seeking. The best I could do is adding the following summary at the end:

SUMMARY

Overall then chinook salmon in the Sacramento System would benefit substantially from habitat improvement features of the common programs both in the river and in the estuary. They would, however, receive little additional benefit from any of the three conveyance alternatives. Existing conflicts with water project operations would continue with Alternative 1, particularly when the Delta Cross Channel Gates are open. These conflicts would be replaced by risks associated with more direct exposure to fish screens and lower flows below Hood under Alternatives 2 and 3.

Chinook salmon in the San Joaquin System would also benefit from habitat improvement features of the common programs, but they would be affected very differently by the three conveyance alternatives. Under Alternatives 1 and 2 existing diversion effects would be perpetuated, offset somewhat by improved fish screens, and for Alternative 2, by improved flow distribution in the western Delta. Under Alternative 3 diversion effects would be reduced by about 80%.

Other fishes in Group 1, such as delta smelt, splittail, striped bass and white catfish, would benefit to varying degrees from habitat improvement features of the common programs. They would also be affected very differently by the three conveyance alternatives. Under Alternative 1, existing diversion and flow distribution effects would be perpetuated. These would be offset some by the improved fish screens, but to a lesser degree than for salmon, since they generally suffer more losses from handling and transport than salmon. They would receive some benefit from Alternative 2, due largely to improved flow distribution in the western Delta, but substantially greater benefit under Alternative 3. The latter would result from approximately an 80 % reduction in diversion losses in the

South Delta and improved flow distribution throughout the Delta. Some risk would continue from exposure to diversions at Hood and reduced flows below Hood.

Group 2 fish would benefit from habitat improvement features of the common programs but be affected relatively little by the conveyance alternatives.

Group 3 fish would also benefit from the common programs. By definition, their greatest risk is to changes in brackish water habitat associated with changes in flow. The best current evidence is that risk will not change measurably from without project conditions.

(Ron: It is risky making a quick summary such as the above, but I thought I would give it a try. Ideally, some others ought to see it before we use it.

I think the tidal flow issue pertains to the mistakes which were in the titles of the original figures and to different perception by Bruce and myself of the significance of net flows. Hence I did not see any changes to make in the text.

Other than his strictly editorial comments, the only other comment for which changes seem appropriate is his last about p. 9 2nd paragraph. I suggest changing to : Except for salmon, fishes included in group 1 generally